



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,809	10/24/2000	Barry L. Spletzer	SD6337/S92307	4279

7590 11/06/2002

Sandia National Laboratories
Patent & Licensing Center
P O Box 5800-MS-0161
Albuquerque, NM 87185-0161

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHANH DUY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/695,809

Applicant(s)

SPLETZER ET AL.

Examiner

Chanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 24, 200 have been considered by examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-8-12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The use of capital letter to each of paragraph of independent claims 1, 8 11 and dependent claim 9 should be avoided because it does not end with a period or sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2675

5. Claims 1, 7-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gitlin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,278,681) in view of Kreitman et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,00).

As to claim 1, Gitlin discloses a video display system as recited in claim 1 with exception of describing the use of an image transformer. For example, Gitlin teaches the image including a first portion to be displayed at a first resolution (e.g., color) and a second portion to be displayed with a second resolution (e.g., high-resolution monochrome). Gitlin teaches a first video source (50) mounted relative to the display medium (26), a second video source (32) mounted relative to the first video source (50) and the display medium (26). Kreitman teaches transformation unit (26) transforming the data to compensate for the misalignment of the basic projector units (24). This reads on the claimed limitation "image transformer" as recited in the claim.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the image transformer as taught by Kreitman to the projector of Gitlin so as to avoid misalign between to image projected by projectors; see column 1, lines 33-45 and column 2, lines 3-30 of Kreitman.

As to claims 8-9 and 11, these claims differ from claim 1 only in that claim 1 is apparatus whereas claims 8-9 and 11 are method. Thus, method claims 8-9 and 11 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to apparatus claim 1 above.

As to claim 7, Kreitman clearly teaches a homogeneous transform see column 7; lines 1-6.

Art Unit: 2675

6. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gitlin in view of Greitman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Washino et al (U.S. Patent 5,625,410).

As to claims 2-6, note the discussion of Gitlin and Greitman above, Gitlin and Greitman do not mention a video steerer as recited in claims 2-3 including pan and tilt motion as recited in claims 5-6. In the same field of endeavor (i.e. projectors), Washino teaches cameras having functions of pan, tilt ; see column 5, lines 8-11 and column 7, line 50 through column 8, line 47. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the video steerer as taught by Washino to the cameras video projecting image as taught by Gitlin as modified by Kreitman so that the image projected the display screen can be adjusted by the operator via the projectors.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603.

Art Unit: 2675

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached at 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


C. Nguyen
October 31, 2002


CHANH NGUYEN
PRIOR ART EXAMINER